United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

74-1770

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

DOCKET NO. 74-1770

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

Appellee

WILLIE JEMISON, JR.,

Appellant

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

APPENDIX FOR APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

Charles N. Sturtevant Assistant Federal Public Defender 450 Main Street Hartford, Connecticut PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page		
Redirect of Jemison by Santos	1	-	8		
Bucklev's Summation	9	-	13		

I think that whatever it was, it would be a whole general idea of whatever it is -- it is a lie. It was involved with people that I don't know. It was involved with people who know that I don't know.

And whatever you are pertaining to, I still don't know.

Q Is it your being on trial here, for allegedly selling two ounces of cocaine, is that more important to you than me alleging here today that you were involved in a four ounce and a pound sale of cocaine at an earlier date?

THE COURT: Well, I think that is an argumentative question.

MR. BUCKLEY: No further questions.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SANTOS:

Q Mr. Jemison, on the 14th and 18th of July, when this transaction occurred, did the contact that Yat had with you play any part in your decision to transfer this narcotic?

A Yes, he asked me on two or three different occasions and he also being on drugs, it has a tendency to make you do that to a person that you think is a friend, that could be harmful to him. He informed me that he had just got out of jail for an arrest --

MR. BUCKLEY: I object.

A -- for marijuana.

MR. BUCKLEY: I object to the witness -- please

(P

don't answer the question -- it is hearsay.

THE COURT: He can ask the question in a different way: Why did you sell it to him?

MR. BUCKLEY: I object if the answer incorporates anything that these people said to him. We are getting back to hearsay again.

THE COURT: I think it is an integral part of his state of mind. The Court will allow it.

Why did you sell it to him?

THE WITNESS: I sold him the drugs due to the fact that he had asked me two or three times, and I considered him as a friend, and he told me he had just got arrested, or he had got out on bond, for the sale of marijuana. And at the time, he was trying to raise some money, so that he would be able to pay his way out of jail. And at the self-same time I wanted some for myself.

MR. SANTOS: Your Honor, I would like permission to inquire as to the conversation he had with this fellow Yat. The Court has already ruled that I would not be allowed to go into this area, but there is really no other way for us to bring it forth.

THE COURT: All right, proceed.

MR. BUCKLEY: I object to that inquiry.

THE COURT: Your objection --

He asked me -- well, he explained to me his problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

A

Q

What was that?

24

25

Did he come to you again?

25

Q

A Yes, he came to me again.

Q What did he ask you this time?

A He asked me, you know, to try to hurry the deal up, because he wanted to get the stuff while he could raise money for a lawyer.

Q This is the third time within a week's span, and Yat approached you again, correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, at what contact from Yat, the first, second or the third, did you do something?

A The third time.

Q Tell us the reason why you finally, after the third time, that you went ahead and tried to get the cocaine for Yat?

A Well, due to the fact that I had a desire to want some myself, I wanted some for my personal use, and at the self-same time, I thought I was doing him a favor by getting the drugs for him, so he could make whatever obligations he had, that he had told me about, and his marijuana deal that he said they busted him on.

Q If it were not for these persistent approaches by Yat, would you have sold any cocaine on the 14th or 18th of July, '72?

A I would have to answer that question and say no, I wouldn't have.

Q

25

And in his words, he said "I'll check around" and "See me the next day", on two different occasions.

Now, Trooper Esson's conversation. He used the word "piece". You all know now the street term for cocaine. He went to the secluded area in the restaurant, and they hackled over price. Although 650 was about the market price, they went to his apartment. They didn't do it cut in the open, and he wanted him to check the stuff, and wanted to see whether he used it or not, to figure out who was dealing with.

He had the album, the spoon, the playing card, the mix -- professionalism.

He put it back in the bag, and bagged it in the bedroom drawer. He said "I know you'll be back, because the stuff is good." That's what Trooper Esson said he said, after Trooper Esson said that he will be back. Does that sound like he didn't want him back? Is Trooper Esson lying about that? He had a report -- he didn't know what the defense was going to be back two years ago.

I submit to you that in both transactions that we have a course of dealing, not a quickie, not a short, quick transaction, where the poor man said

4 5

"Please leave me alone; I want to get rid of the cocaine; I'll give it to you to get you off my back." If that was all that you had, and you took the Defendant's facts, I submit that you could still find the Defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

But, to make it easier for you, you have a lot more than that. On March 4th, we have extensive negotiations -- I will hit the high points of those in a minute.

What is more important, we got the playing card, we got a scale, we got the baggie, and we got the same person, the same Defendant, March 5th, 1972, mixing this stuff in an apartment. The ounces were taken out of a pizza box.

Now, those four ounces, according to the agents who did this for a living, undercover, was a large amount of cocaine. I think that is important.

Look at the quantities involved. The kind of man who -- he told you he supported his habit, that he didn't support his habit by selling narcotics, he did it by pimping. What was he doing there March 5th?

I submit to you that he was not a high class junkie; that he was a high class dealer, and he was a professional. And he may have been a pimp, but



he was a very good drug dealer. On the days that he talked about, the 14th and 18th, and March 5th, he wasn't out watching women, he seemed to be watching his drugs, as a professional would do. And he must have needed a good profession to support this habit, that he tried to tell you about.

I submit that he was a professional. And he was a high class one. But, he was not a junkie.

He was a dealer. And the Government has proven that.

Now, with respect to the particular transaction in March. You have here not the testimony of one Government agent, who may have a faulty memory — if the defense wants to claim it; I don't know whether they will; they didn't attack any of these men as puffing one bit. We have got two men with a lot of money on them, in an undercover capacity, out of town, with police activity in the area dealing with three or four other individuals, one of whom very clearly, from their testimony, is Mr. Jemison.

And they meet him in this lounge where Agent O'Brien is. And Mr. Jemison wants to know what is the hassle about? Alfonso Smith is there, and Mr. Jemison says in front of Smith and O'Brien that